

228/199

Handwritten: n-t-d
PRICE: 10 Cents
Handwritten: Jean Baptiste

JEAN-BAPTISTE

TO HIS

Anglo-Canadian Brother

AN OPEN LETTER

EDITED BY

U. B.

As a contribution to the National Unity
Movement.



QUEBEC
The Telegraph Printing Co.

1917

Handwritten:
P
F5012
1917
B2845

The EDITH *and* LORNE PIERCE
COLLECTION *of* CANADIANA



Queen's University at Kingston

[Barthe]

5.

(F248)

JEAN-BAPTISTE

TO HIS

Anglo - Canadian Brother

AN OPEN LETTER

BROTHER BILL,

I have a certain advantage over you. I know you, and you don't know me. That is, I am kept pretty well posted on what I might call your idiosyncrasies, especially on your peculiar feelings and current views on questions in which we are both interested.

Your excellent magazines and other periodicals are freely and largely circulated in this Province; no boycott on them, we see them everywhere, at every news stand, not only in our large cities, but in every little town as well. They are subscribed to and read by thousands of French Canadians. How many of you are subscribers to French papers published in Quebec? Do you ever see one on the counter of your news stores, in your big hotels and railway stations? I wonder if even our leading dailies are to be found west of our boundary line, anywhere outside of those of your editorial offices which deign to accept them as exchanges.

This is to explain why I know you by heart, while I rather look as a stranger to you. If you don't read my papers, I read yours—at least when my spectacles are at hand. As a matter of fact, a magnifying glass would not be too much to decipher the microscopic and compact letter-press to which your eyesight is used, whereas my favorite gazette must be printed in prayer book type, with plenty of air and light circulating all through between the lines and paragraphs. In this, if not in the matter of large families, I apparently care more for quality than quantity. This is one of the little differences between us—and there are many others.

* * *

Of course, I don't mean to say that I peruse everything that is printed in your language, but very little, if any, of the public effusions of your thinkers, politicians and writers escapes my attention; what I don't read myself, I get it translated in my own vernacular. Thus have I become aware of the disagreeable fact, that while I am familiar with your characteristics good or bad, you know me only by half—and alas! it is the worst to look at. If I was half as black as the cartoon picture you have of me, I should be ashamed of myself.

Leaving aside the *obligato* mutual compliments that are now and then being exchanged between the Bonne Entente delegates, is it not a fact that in the majority of cases what you are given to read about my person is not of the loving-cup

variety? In recent years especially, your daily bread has been of the God-*strafe*-the-French type. Were you to believe some of our most vociferous slanderers, the yellow scare, even the German scare, were nothing compared to the French scare. For instance, the ringing appeal of the Grand Master of the Orange Lodge is still in your ears, threatening in Hohenzollern tones to raise 250,000 old men in one month's time to crush down any attempt to establish a French Republic in the Province of Quebec! It is to laugh! Who ever thought of such a silly notion as the Republic of Quebec?

* * *

Extremes meet. We have our cranks as you have yours. In every free country, are always to be found a certain number of troublesome demagogues, hot-headed enough to take advantage of the liberty of speech—the enjoyment of which we are so proud of—to make themselves conspicuous by their appeals to racial or religious fanaticism, or by their disloyal clamorings. Those are accidental excrescences, tumors if you like, but no criterion of the normal health of the body. Would you judge of England by its Bernard Shaws? It would be as illogical to judge of Quebec by its Bourassas. Neither do I hold your average responsible for the periodical bursts of wild talk of the Orange Lodge which year after year, since time immemorial, keeps on rehashing the same old time stories about Popery, with the difference that the Battle of the Boyne, which was waged

against the Jacobites and the Irish, has now turned its guns against the French Canadians exclusively.

We are all a liberty loving people. Since you tolerate in your own community the free use of such loud talk, how can you expect us to gag and muzzle our own firebrands?

However, I might here claim a point in our favor. While your Dalton McCarthys and Clark Wallaces, not to mention their survivors, were given exalted positions in your ranks, in Quebec we have a discreet, constitutional way of getting rid of our meddlesome fellows. Look at their leader Bourassa, whose name, I know, is in your mind at this moment—the inventor of a narrow parochial nationalism. What practical results has he to show after ten years of strenuous campaigning? He once was a member of the Dominion Parliament, he then stepped down in the Local Legislature, where he made a very short stay. From repudiation to repudiation, from fall to fall, he has been quietly, but steadily shoved on, deserted by his former disciples one after the other, until he is now relegated to his editorial den whence he cannot be dragged out unless we return to the rude manners of past centuries, when people were persecuted and put in jail for their political opinions.

Gone is his prestige, with his influence. Racial appeals may have their day in Quebec as in Ontario, but the solid good sense of the people soon gets over it. They see that after all it requires no transcendent talent, no genuine superiority of mind to stir up old racial feuds and

to rekindle the smouldering fire of jealousy and hatred which is latent in the bottom of every human heart. Anybody can do that, with a pair of bellows.

* * *

Let us examine quietly, one by one, some of your pretended grudges against me.

First of all, the matter of creed, which produces such infuriating effect on your Orange fellows. They represent me as priest-ridden, aggressive in my worship, too lavish on magnificent cathedrals and too little on manufactures. I lose too much time at church, and my children have too much catechism at school. In short, to sum up the indictment, my thoughts are so deeply absorbed in the contemplation of eternal truths that I have no eye on business and am too easy going in wordly matters.

No worst moment than this could be chosen for a revival of old quarrels of that kind. The present war has brought our souls closer to one another. All earthly considerations have given way to solemn thoughts. To use the beautiful language of the Abbé Thellier de Poncheville in his wonderful Lent sermons in Notre-Dame Church, Montreal: "Whether we will or no, we must gaze heavenward. Death, in planting its sting in our flesh, has planted its problem in our indifference". It cannot be denied that the calamitous times we traverse cause a universal revival of religious fervor. In that spiritual uplifting we all commune, whether our confession

is Catholic or Protestant, and I feel sure that under the circumstances, as a practical man, you could not find fault with other people because, to be on the safe side and to take no chance, they seek to reach Heaven by the shortest cut, which is well known to be the roughest.

For that reason, I am represented to you as a backward citizen, medieval in my thoughts, slow in my actions, and therefore less favored with earthly goods. It is certain that under my system there are less made-rich-quick millionnaires; but then, wealth is more equably distributed, which is, if I am not mistaken, just the right thing in political economy. Even supposing that I practise too much the virtue of poverty, what should you grumble about, since it is so much less competition to your business? But be easy on that point—spiritual matters do not make me neglect the temporal. Who can say that the Dominion suffers from the alleged laziness of the Province of Quebec? The latter's giant strides in agriculture and industry, its highway system alone, considered the best on the continent, are proof of the contrary. ⁽¹⁾

(1) Maclean's Magazine recently published an interesting paper on the Motor Roads of Canada, which contains the following:

"Since 1912, the Province of Quebec has constructed over 2,000 miles of first class permanently improved highways, the government contribution towards the building of which has been close to seventeen million dollars. More than that, at the last session of the legislature, another five million dollars was appropriated for the further extension of the provincial system. The net result is that *Quebec is far in the van of other Canadian provinces*, having as a matter of fact more permanently improved highways than all the other provinces put together."

Priest-ridden, you say? Well, I confess my profound reverence for the Church, its holy teachings, its sacraments and its ministers. But, that I am not priest-ridden in civil matters is superabundantly evidenced by the political history of Quebec,—it being well known that the clergy of all denominations, in all countries, is by the very nature of its austere training mostly to be found on the safer side of caution and conservation, a course which, surely, I cannot be suspected of having followed very religiously so far. Not much!

* * *

Next, the matter of language, another stumbling-stone in the path of Better Understanding.

For my part, I have always been at a loss to get at the true cause of that sacred horror which some of your spokesmen affect to profess towards the French language, in fact against everything that is French. Do they correctly interpret your feelings? Do you really mean it? If not, you are fearfully misrepresented, and I loyally invite you to come forward and tell me the truth.

In private conversation, I am now and then given to understand that all that newspaper and platform loud talk against the French language is nothing but politics, and that it should read as the Bryan note, with a postscript notice "not to be taken seriously". If you are not in the game, if you don't countenance it, it seems to me you should get up and notify both parties that you are not going to stand such nonsense any longer.

Francophobia begets anglophobia, and *vice*

versa. It is a vicious circle out of which we are both interested to escape by all means, and I may assure you that on my side the number of Anglo-phobes is fast dwindling down to a Corporal's guard; if there was no provocation, there would be none left.

Some gentry, I know, think it good style to treat "*Frenchy*" with scorn. But, tell me, would not "*Frenchy*" appear to you as the most contemptible of men if he renounced and repudiated the language of his ancestors? Especially at this moment, when France and England are fighting shoulder to shoulder for their, nay, for our liberties; when the leading men of the British Empire and many in Canada, witness Lord Shaughnessy, openly propose that bilingual teaching, French and English, be made compulsory in all schools!

What! Bilingualism! never! will answer some of those who claim to speak in your name. "Ontario is an English province!" I beg your pardon, Ontario is British, and the noble flag in which she proudly drapes herself is a symbol of liberty and tolerance. To me, it is moreover a pledge.

Here I would refer you to the masterly articles recently published by the *Canadian Courier*, in Toronto, the author of which, Mr. Wm. H. Moore, takes the stand that the French language ought to be given unchecked rights over the whole land ceded by the French to the English under the Treaty of Paris; that the Quebec Act of 1774 (there was no Ontario then) was a pledge to that effect; that it was not questioned by the first English speaking inhabitants of this country, the

United Empire Loyalists, who showed themselves friendly to the French population; that the trouble commenced with the later immigration from the British Isles, bringing in its wake the Oligarchy, the Family Compact and the resulting struggle for political rights and responsible government. Such is the teaching of impartial history. Mr. Moore's authority is taken from the records and historical works of the eighteenth century, published in England.

It is true that one of your leading dailies, the *Toronto News*, on the 2nd June, 1914, (before the war) boldly repudiated the pledge, under the pretence, that even "if the text was clear and unequivocal..... one hundred year old treaties must be interpreted in the light of new circumstances." The German Chancellor was to take exactly the same stand two months later, anent another old treaty which guaranteed the neutral rights of Belgium. In both cases, a scrap of paper! But of late the scrap of paper business has become much discredited.

How mean and small does look all that pettifoggling and quibbling and scribbling about the interpretation of laws and by-laws, at the very moment our mother-countries are signing a treaty of everlasting alliance with their richest blood! ALLIES IN EUROPE—ALIENS IN CANADA! Is that common sense?

I may perhaps be permitted to speak thus on account of my birthright, something which no human power can take away from me. Am I not the first *Canadien* by primogeniture? and if as

the elder in the national family I hold an imprescriptible claim, surely you, as my junior brother, cannot find fault with me for resorting to every constitutional means to get at least a part of my heritage.

Some people may tell you that I have nothing common with France, that my language is *patois*, that French as spoken here is not the same as it is written, and so on. What about your own slang and twang, your own verbal barbarisms and solecisms,—such expressions as *ain't*, *shan't*, *don-chno*, *gotta*, *c'r'nel*, etc., and your cockney accent, and your broad Scotch, and your Irish brogue? A simple matter of local dialect. The same with me. Very few of us can be expected to speak as academicians.

I cordially invite you to pay me a visit. Then you will see things in a different light. That question of language now appears to you as a high, insuperable dividing wall between us. On my side of the fence there is no barbed wire. Everywhere in our towns and villages, you can get along without an interpreter. Our trades people, artisans, farmers are quite familiar with your business terminology. We have gone more than half-way to meet you. Better Understanding is on our side.

* * *

And what about my loyalty to the British flag?

Spare me the trouble of rehearsing the old stories of 1775 and 1812. How many times have

you been told that if there is a British Ontario, and a British Canada, it is due to my forefathers, who, depending on that very pledge of 1774 which guaranteed them the full enjoyment of all their privileges, stubbornly resisted the repeated cajolings of their American neighbours, and when the latter invaded the country repulsed them by force of arms!

I am tired of having to produce my identification papers every time it pleases the first comer to cast a doubt on my fealty. The very fact of being all the time under suspicion would be enough to turn one a traitor. Still I never flinched from the straight line of duty. If I fought in 1837 shoulder to shoulder with the Reformers of Upper Canada, it was to secure the constitutional system of government which to-day makes our common pride. I did not burn the Parliament buildings, neither did I rotten-egg the Queen's representative, nor sign the Annexation Manifesto of 1849.

My loyalty to Great Britain is equal to yours, although of a different essence. Yours is inherited, it springs naturally from the heart, it speaks from blood, and is actuated by ancestral pride. Mine, although deprived of such powerful incentives, is none the less indefectible; it is perhaps the more meritorious, matured as it is by reflection, springing as it does from a deep sense of admiration for Great Britain, better known as the Motherland of constitutional institutions. If French Canada was ever *conquered*—a word which you know sounds unpleasantly to my ears—it was by the pledge of 1774, followed later

on by the granting of self government, decentralisation of power and Home Rule. Trust me, Brother Bill, half as much as your Mother-country has done, and everything will be O. K.

* * *

For instance, in the matter of recruiting, do you consider that I have had fair play?

Because there happen to be in this Province a few extremists who, as much out of hatred for France as for England, are discountenancing the patriotic movement, you have been told over and over again that the whole Province of Quebec was not only lukewarm, but decidedly hostile to our participation in the war. For over two years, most of the western press has been hurling insult and mud at the French Canadians, representing them as "slackers", calling them traitors, rebels, cowards, Hun imitators, unworthy of the right to vote and to share in the government of this country. Some went as far as making direct appeals to civil war. It was sowing poison in your mind, and at the same time exasperation in my heart.

Of course, the utter falseness of the above charges was shown up in the French press; but the articles in my defence had little echo in your surroundings, so that it may be assumed that you practically know only one side of the story.

Now, as I positively object to being tried, convicted and sentenced in my absence, *ex parte*

and on mere hearsay evidence, I intend to submit to your fair consideration a few facts and figures which should induce you to reverse your judgment if you have already pronounced against me.

The best, if not the only way, to get at the true facts would be the production of the official enlistment rolls published by the Militia Department, in which the recruits are designedly classified by country of birth. So far, only a few number of them have been distributed, but they convey enough information to show the way recruiting works all around. I wish you would examine the following summary, and tell me what you think about it.

SUMMARY OF 62 NOMINAL ROLLS OF INFANTRY BATTALIONS AND A FEW
UNITS OF ARTILLERY, ETC.

	No. of men enlisted	Canadian born	French Canadians	British and Foreign born
INFANTRY:				
Western Canada.....	22,977	5,095	179	17,882
Ontario.....	17,514	5,392	166	12,122
Ont. & Quebec (mixed)....	3,836	1,467	143	2,369
Quebec.....	14,077	8,688	5,939	5,389
Maritime Prov.....	5,358	3,195	368	2,163
Princess Pats.....	1,630	190	3	1,440
Royal Can. Regt.....	906	250	31	656
ARTILLERY.....	9,097	3,608	240	5,489
CAVALRY.....	3,778	1,016	51	2,762
RED CROSS.....	2,926	1,717	578	1,209
OTHER SERVICES.....	4,710	1,155	155	3,155
	86,809	32,173	7,853	54,636
		7,853	French Can.	
		24,320	Anglo Can.	

Foreign born: about 63 p.c. Proportion of Anglo-Canadians: 28 p.c.

The above total of 86,809 men represents but one-fifth of the Expeditionary Force. However fragmentary it is, it elicits the fact that the French Canadians have contributed one man for

every three natives enlisted in the rest of the country. Not too bad for an element which counts for one-fourth of the whole population.

The following excerpt from the above gives more particulars about recruiting in the Province of Quebec:—

	Number enlisted	Canadian born	French Canadians	British and Foreign born
Province of Quebec—English Battalions:				
14th—Lt. Col. Meighen.....	1,173	521	274	652
42th—Lt. Col. Cantlie.....	1,018	281	30	737
60th—Lt. Col. Gascoigne.....	1,393	454	88	939
73rd—Lt. Col. Davidson.....	1,071	410	22	661
24th—Lt. Col. Gunn.....	1,175	377	27	798
P. P. C. L. I. (McGill University).....	1,151	632	2	519
	6,981	2,675	443	4,306

Canadian Born: 39 per cent.

	Number enlisted	Canadian born	French Canadians	British and Foreign born
Province of Quebec—French- Canadian Batt'ns:				
22nd—Lt. Col. Gaudet.....	1,171	1,122	1,124	47
41st and Reinf. Draft—Lt. Col Archambault.....	1,360	1,057	1,001	303
57th and Reinf. Draft.....	704	515	438	189
69th—Lt. Col. Dansereau.....	1,068	786	680	282
150th—Lt. Col. Barré.....	667	598	538	69
163rd—Lt. Col. Desrosiers....	892	795	726	97
189th—Lt. Col. Piuze.....	760	713	604	47
167 Reinf. Draft.....	83	69	64	14
178th Reinf. Draft.....	46	42	41	4
206th Reinf. Draft.....	345	314	281	31
	7,096	6,013	5,496	1,083

Canadian Born: 85 per cent

There have been 15 French Canadian battalions of infantry commandeered so far, including the above, viz: 22nd, 41st, 57th, 69th, 150th, 163rd, 165th, 167th, 178th, 189th, 206th, 230th, 233rd, to which may be added the 171st ($\frac{1}{3}$ French,

$\frac{1}{3}$ Russian, now in England) and the 258th now under formation by Hon. P. E. Blondin.

* * *

Seeing that the question has been placed on racial grounds, it is obvious that any comparing of the contribution in men should be restricted to the native contingent, and on that score, it is equally evident that French Canada, taking into account the adverse circumstances in which it is situated, compares very well, man for man, with the rest of the country.

In support of this, let me quote a few testimonials which cannot be suspected of partiality.

Dr. Norman Allan, then Chairman of the Toronto Recruiting League, declared in April 1916 "that the native population of Quebec could stand the comparison, in recruiting, with the native population of other provinces": a frank and loyal statement which, by the way, cost Dr. Allan the presidency of the League and the displeasure of the *Telegram*, which said that his remarks would hurt recruiting since "the Ontario natives were compared to the rebellious sons of Quebec." Another instance of the Entente Cordiale as practised by the Ontario firebrands!

A London cable published in the *Montreal Gazette*, December 27th, 1914, contained the following:

"At the present time Quebec and British Columbia provinces have a larger representation

of battalions in France in proportion to the number of men recruited from them, than the other provinces, and in the past it has been necessary to draw reinforcements for these battalions from other centres and an effort is now being made to equalize the representation and replace those thus absorbed."

More recently, the same paper published the following editorial remarks:

ILL-ADVISED ATTACKS

Montreal Gazette:—"Many French Canadians have enlisted, have gone to the battlefields of France, and have there made the supreme sacrifice. The clergy, from Archbishop to parish priest, have urged the duty of enlistment upon the young men of their race, so have many newspapers, and many public men, and to embrace the whole French-Canadian population in a sweeping denunciation as traitors and poltroons is unjust, condemnable and an incentive to that very condition affected to be deplored."

* * *

The adverse circumstances above referred to in connection with recruiting in Quebec may be summed up as follows:

I

The placing of all the recruiting organization in the hands of English-speaking officers who did not understand the French-Canadian temper.

Hon. Sydney Fisher, speaking in Sherbrooke on the 26th March, said that "personally he believed that if Sir Sam Hughes had entrusted the task of recruiting in this Province to Major General Lessard, 50,000 French Canadians would now be in the fighting line."

On the morrow of that speech, it was announced in the Government press that General Lessard had been called to take charge of recruiting in Quebec. This comes rather late in the day, this being the third year of the war.

* * *

The proportion of married men, which is much larger in Quebec than in the English provinces.

According to the last census, Ontario itself has in round figures 110,000 unmarried men above twenty years of age more than Quebec.

* * *

The disparity of the rural population against Quebec.

It is well known that recruiting is much more effective in larger centres of population. Ontario, for instance, has 148 cities, towns and villages, with a population of 1,328,499 against Quebec

only 72 with a population of 970,096. Limited to cities proper, the comparison stands thus:

Population, 25,000 and above.....	4	2
From 20,000 to 25,000.....	14	7
Under 10,000.....	26	13
	—	—
	44	22

The advantage for city recruiting is thus shown to be two to one in favor of Ontario.

Mr. A. Rives Hall, K.C., of Montreal, recently wrote a letter to the *New York Times* in which he says:

“It may be unhesitatingly asserted that the only reason Ontario and the Western Provinces have enlisted larger numbers than Quebec is because they have an immensely greater number of British born residents. The following figures are taken from the census of 1911, and if later figures were available the balance would be still more favorable to Quebec:

	British born	P.c. British born to na- tive born.
Quebec.....	68,000	3-7
Ontario.....	349,000	17
Manitoba.....	91,000	34
Saskatchewan.....	77,000	30
Alberta.....	66,000	40
British Columbia.....	107,000	63

“As everyone knows, the Northwest is a country of young men, and even in Ontario the proportion of young men is much higher than in Quebec. A third element that should also be taken into consideration is the excess of males, and then again our province is very much behind Ontario and the West.

P. c. of Males between the ages of 20-40 to total.

	Male Pop.	Excess of Males
Quebec.....	29	20,000
Ontario.....	36	75,000
Manitoba.....	36	45,000
Saskatchewan.....	44	91,000
Alberta.....	44	73,000
British Columbia.....	50	110,000

IV

The fact that Quebec has much less floating population of foreign birth than Ontario and the West.

When it was shown that Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan with a population of 1,303,709 had supplied 139,800 soldiers, or nearly 10½ p. c., while the 2,523,274 inhabitants of Ontario had barely given 169,900 men, or just 6½ p. c., the *Toronto Mail* explained away that disparity in one single sweeping sentence: “The West has a large proportion of foreigners”.

If this excuse is good for Ontario, it should be excellent for Quebec, which has very little French immigration, and whose French population is largely rural, while in the cities there is much less unemployed labor than in the Western provinces.

Your own papers have admitted that as the reserve of foreign born recruits has been gradually exhausted, and could no more swell the ranks of your regiments, recruiting is found to be as hard as in Quebec, if not harder.

"It is true that there are slackers in Toronto". (The Sentinel, August 14th).

As far back as the spring of 1915, the *Mail* stated very plainly "that the military authorities were not satisfied with the small share of recruiting done in Toronto."

The same, Dec. 3rd, 1915: "There are thousands and thousands of young men, unmarried, physically fit, who ought to enlist, but who do not respond the call".

From the *Globe*: "Guelph, Nov. 28th.—A squad of five men under Capt. Hindson came in here on Friday night to recruit, and up till to-night they had secured but one recruit".

From the *Telegram*, Dec. 11th.—"It took three officers and twelve men three days' work in one Ontario rural district to get two recruits."

From the *Mail*, Dec. 12th.—"Deadly apathy", etc., etc.

La Presse, of Montreal, from which some of the above quotations are taken, says: "The Ontario Jingo now see what it is to be left alone, without the help of the immigrants, now nearly all trained."

I wish to be distinctly understood. My plea is not that the Province of Quebec has done its fullest share to the recruiting, but that it has done fully as much as would have done any other province under similar circumstances.

* * *

As a moral to my story, I could hardly imagine anything more to the point than those beautiful words used by Vice-President Marshall on the Inaugural Day at Washington (March 4th):

"I believe I can reach the highest ideal of my tradition, and my lineage as an American, as a man, as a citizen and as a public official, when I judge my fellow men without malice and with charity, *when I worry more about my own motives and conduct and less about the motives and conduct of others*".

This is the spirit of tolerance, good will and *Bonne Entente*, which has guided my hand in penning this letter, and with which I subscribe myself

Fraternally yours,

JEAN BAPTISTE.

APPENDIX

SOME of the Inspiring Declarations of the "Bonne Entente" delegates visiting Ontario, January last:

SIR LOMER GOUIN, at Toronto, January 8th:

"Nature, history and Providence alike proclaim our brotherhood. ***

"History offers examples of the fact that in the building of nations variety of qualities and virtues is an element of strength tending to national consolidation. (Applause.) ***

"Sir George Cartier rightly held that here as in Great Britain diversity could only contribute to the common prosperity, and he laid his hand on the only possible danger in pointing out that danger could only lie in refusing justice to a minority. (Applause.) ***

"The Englishman, the Scot and the Irishman could go across the ocean and say he was going home. The French Canadian's only home was in Canada. ***

"We are destined by Providence to live together; we must whether we like it or not." ***

HON. W. R. HEARST, at Toronto, same meeting:

"Hoped that this visit would broaden the viewpoint of each one.

"Let us forget all else, working with a single purpose, in order that we may bring victory."

G. LYNCH STAUNTON, at Hamilton, January 9th:

"Predicted an amalgamation of the British and French races in Canada, such as had taken place in England through Norman and Saxon intermingling.

"Foreign elements would be impressed on Canada unless we who were here first, French and English, unite to own Canada." (Applause.)

J. P. BELL, at same meeting:

"The people of Hamilton were glad of the opportunity for mutual respect, which they hoped would lead to genuine good-will. French and English should be taught to all children."

HON. JUSTICE PELLETIER, at same meeting:

"Old religious differences should not be rehashed and rehearsed. There were so many things on which they could agree that it was not worth while endangering Canadian unity on the things in disagreement. (Loud applause.)"

COL. R. DE LA BRUÈRE GIROUARD:

"Taking the Canadian born in each Province, the enlistment had been for Quebec 1.7 per hundred, and for Ontario 1.9 per hundred, only a fraction in difference."
